



MEETING MINUTES

**HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD (HAB, Board)
Public Involvement and Communications Committee (PIC)**

April 11, 2022

Virtual Meeting via Microsoft Teams

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Opening.....	2
Open Question/Discussion.....	2
Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) Public Involvement Calendar.....	4
Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) Five-Year Review Process.....	5
Fiscal Year 2023 Work Plan and Calendar Overview.....	8
Open Forum/Assessing the Balance between Policy Work and Technical Understanding.....	10
Committee Business	12
Closing	13
Meeting Recording	13
Attachments	13
Attendees	13

This is only a summary of issues and actions discussed at this meeting. It may not represent the fullness of represented ideas or opinions, and it should not be used as a substitute for actual public involvement or public comment on any particular topic unless specifically identified as such.

Opening

Gary Younger, US Department of Energy (DOE), serving as Deputy Designated Federal Officer (DDFO), announced that the meeting was being held in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act.

Jeff Burright, Oregon Department of Energy, greeted and welcomed the meeting participants.

Shelley Cimon, Columbia Riverkeeper, asked Gary for a status on the HAB membership packet. Gary explained that recruitment was complete and the first revision of the packet had been submitted to DOE Headquarters (DOE-HQ) for initial review. He noted that the Washington Tree Fruit Association was submitted as a replacement Hanford Watch's previous seat. Shelley noted that the seat in question was an environmental seat, and that organization was an industrial body. She wanted to understand how and why it was submitted for the seat, hoping to see that justification in writing. She was concerned by the lack of collaboration with the HAB in that selection. Jeff asked that the topic be revisited later.

Ruth Nicholson, HAB Facilitator, provided a review of the agenda. She noted that a Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) public involvement calendar review would be added to the day's topics, which was not in the initial agenda.

Meeting Minute Approval

The committee adopted its draft December 2021 and February 2022 meeting minutes with one correction, recognizing Liz Mattson's service as both chair and vice chair for HAB committees in the past.

Nominations for Chair and Vice Chair Elections

The committee was invited to submit leadership nominations. The present chair and vice chair, Jeff Burright and Dan Solitz respectively, were each nominated to resume their roles. Each stated they were willing to serve, should no other members wish to step into those roles. Each were elected by committee vote.

Open Question/Discussion

The committee was invited to answer the question of: "On a scale from 1-5 (5 is a yes), do you believe that Hanford cleanup is going the right way?" and, as a follow up questions, "Why did you not give a lower score?" and "Why did you not give a higher score?"

Ruth Nicholson tracked the answers provided as part of a force field analysis exercise.

Why did you not give a lower score?

Dan Solitz, Oregon Hanford Cleanup Board, stated that he gave it a 2.5. He thought that the completion of the Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP) demolition and the Site's progress on the Low-Activity Waste (LAW) facility were encouraging.

Tom Sicilia, Oregon Department of Energy, scored it a three because high-profile, long-standing projects such as those in the River Corridor and the PFP were completed or nearing completion.

Liz Mattson, Hanford Challenge, gave it a two with the statement of "things could always get worse." She felt there was a robust, broad community of interest and engagement, which was encouraging.

Tom Galioto, Tri-City Development Council (TRIDEC), gave it a two, crediting the Direct-Feed Low-Activity Waste (DFLAW) and Tank-Side Cesium Removal (TSCR) projects.

Chris Sutton, Public at Large, gave it a three. He stated there had been a lot of progress in cleanup, particularly regarding groundwater cleanup and DFLAW. He also thought that the Site workforce was dedicated and took pride in the progress being made and expected that the workforce would continue in that manner.

Jeff Burright scored it a 2.5, noting many of his reason had already been mentioned. Looking back, he felt that a lot of progress was made in cleanup, such as moving waste away from the river to long-term disposal and storage. Further, there was evolution in the modelling that would be used to frame the decisions of the future.

Shannon Cram, University of Washington, provided a two, stating that trajectory informed that number. She credited accomplishments in waste management and appreciated the safety that provided.

Gerry Pollet, Heart of America Northwest, felt that Liz's words described his thoughts well: "things could be worse." He felt that the state of the Site was awful from a public trust standpoint. He stated that was no effort to account for the possibility of an earthquake occurring before capsule movement, the public concern of a leaking high-level waste tank had not been addressed, and incidents of contamination in the PFP demolition efforts were not worth meriting. He reiterated that the only reason his own score was not lower was that public trust and confidence in the direction of Hanford cleanup could somehow get worse, though he found that possibility difficult to imagine.

Dan Strom, Benton-Franklin Health District, noted that he agreed with some of the comments made previously. He was pleased with the progress made on DFLAW, TSCR, as well as the K-Basins, Waste Encapsulation and Storage Facility (WESF), and the 300 Area.

Why did you not give it a higher score?

Tom Sicilia stated that the only metric he had for progress was the milestones, but no schedule for the mission was available to the public, to his knowledge. He could not determine if the mission was on pace or lagging.

Tom Galioto did not provide a higher score because he felt that the engagement of the public had been poor, including responses to HAB advice. He stated that project accelerations that the Board identified as cleanup priorities in previous advice had still not occurred.

Liz's reason was a feeling that there was a lack of effective engagement with the broader public and a lack of transparency in information sharing.

Chris stated that, on DOE's part, there was not enough discrimination on technical matters where it was "nice to have" versus "got to have." He was concerned about Site funding going forward. He felt there was too much interference from DOE-HQ, which he felt was evidenced by the number of signoffs required for the local DOE to provide a presentation to the public. He expected that interreference would result in an inability to take necessary actions at a local level.

Jeff forewarned the committee that he would be mixing some metaphors. He stated that his big question was: "can you know if it's going the right way without knowing the destination?" There was a desire among the Board's members to talk about end states, as the cleanup would not be a "one-and-done" thing; instead, it was like a painted that needed to be touched up. He felt that it was important to understand how actions fit into the end state in order to assess the direction or how that direction progressed toward the destination. Such concerns included waste definitions, assumptions of institutional controls, etc. It was unclear which stakeholders would "have a hand on the tiller," or which could or would be meaningfully

involved. Jeff stated, as a finishing thought, there was also a question of the cleanup going the right way in terms of building trust with future generations.

Shannon agreed with Jeff. In her initial reaction to the question, she thought that it was not clear how to evaluate it when there was not a shared definition of success. Without a shared vision, she was unsure how to define “what is clean.”

Liz stated that there had not been an effort to build a collaborative vision for cleanup or gather different visions. She did not feel that it had to be collaborate, necessarily, but there should be a process to gather those. She felt that there was a “get out of our way” tone in DOE’s communication, which prevented trust building. In regard to communications around funding, she felt there was a disconnect in the rhetoric. The public was told to expect flat funding in some cases but told that the Site needed more funding in others.

Steve Anderson, Grant and Franklin Counties, stated his score was in the “3 range.” He felt the site was vastly different and improved over the last 20 years, but still required a tremendous amount of burdensome paperwork, and expected that caused things to move slowly. He felt the Site was not as far along as it should be and that there needed to be a better definition of the end state. He agreed that public education was necessary for the public to be able to voice its opinion and that funding would be an issue.

With the exercise concluded, Chris asked what would be done with the results. Jeff explained that there were no plans, and that the discussion was intended to work like a round robin discussion to get ideas out. If there were ideas that came forth members felt could be acted upon, however, that would be worth considering, such as what could be done to raise the given scores.

Ruth Nicholson provided an explanation of the force field analysis. Using *Attachment 5* as a visual aid, she explained that, at a conceptual level, one would either need to make positive aspects stronger or negative aspects weaker to “push” the dividing line between the two—the force field—toward a higher score. Though, as many members pointed out, there needed to be a clear goal in mind to do so. She was curious to learn if the committee found the exercise helpful.

Liz liked that it got people’s thoughts “on the table,” but was frustrated that DOE did not participate in the exercise. She wondered if a similar exercise or follow-up question could be part of the HAB’s Leadership Workshop. Shannon felt it was nice to have a visual representation of the ideas stated, seeing the positives and negatives side-by-side. Gerry felt that it was valuable to hear the perspectives, noting that it seemed that many people agreed that there needed to be extensive public engagement to ensure public perspectives influence cleanup. He felt the results needed to be shared. Tom Galioto commented that the problems were identified, but not solutions. He felt an interaction with DOE was needed.

Chris noted that what was being discussed was the process of cleanup and that, when obstacles are encountered in a process, a six-sigma workshop could be held to streamline that process. He felt it was an ideal topic for such a workshop.

Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) Public Involvement Calendar

Daina McFadden, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), reviewed Ecology’s active comment periods. Those included an agency-initiated permit modification for the HLW Vitrification Facility and a fire station-related construction notice. It was noted that there was no public meeting scheduled for the permit modification.

Dana Cowley, Hanford Mission Integration Solutions (HMIS), reviewed DOE’s active and upcoming comment periods. It was noted that the comment period for the 2022 Hanford Lifecycle Scope, Schedule, and Cost Report was extended to the end of April, by request. Additional comment periods included the

Hanford Site Cleanup Priorities, several Liquid Effluent Retention Facility (LERF) and Effluent Treatment Facility (ETF)-related permit modifications, and a 242-A Evaporator permit modification.

Gerry Pollet stated that, from the public's point of view, having several comment periods related to the same facilities, in this case LERF and ETF, was confusing. He wondered if there had been discussion or consideration of combining those. Dana explained, from previous discussions on the topic, it was her understanding that the project team saw potential for construction delay depending on the comments received. It was expected that certain comment periods for those facilities would result in more substantial comments than others, so it was preferred that they remained separate so those with less substantial comments could move forward. Gerry stated that some of the subjects were integrally related, such as groundwater protection and groundwater monitoring, which made it difficult for the public to distinguish between certain comment periods and difficult to understand where specific concerns or questions needed to be directed. He noted that if the PIC was engaged in the subject earlier, it could have provided feedback. Ryan Miller, Ecology, thanked Gerry for the feedback and stated he would bring that to the attention of the associated DOE and Ecology project leads.

Dan Solitz asked why instrumentation work was being planned for the HLW Vitrification facility despite the construction being halted. Dana was unsure but agreed to pass the question along. Jeff Burright and Liz Mattson provided some additional background to Dan's question, reviewing the Defense Nuclear Facility Safety Board's (DNFSB) findings which led to construction to be halted and result in the Site's prioritization of DFLAW. Ryan noted that the topic was under consideration for a future "Let's Talk About Hanford" event. He noted that the March's event focused on LERF, ETF, and the 242-A in preparation for those public comment periods.

On the topic of LERF and ETF, Jeff announced that the National Academy of Sciences would be conducting a public meeting in Richland to hold discussions with DOE and the national laboratories regarding alternatives for LAW treatment.

Gerry noted that materials for the fiscal year (FY) 2023 Hanford budget materials were not yet available, despite being requested at the March 15 public workshop for use in commenting on FY24 priorities. He stated that information was necessary in order to provide meaningful comments. He asked that the associated comment period be extended, as it was expected that DOE-HQ would eventually be publishing that information. Dana noted that a request for extension was not yet received and could be submitted through comment. In the interim, Ryan noted, Ecology published a [news release](#) and [one-page document](#) discussing Ecology's funding predictions, which could be helpful.

Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) Five-Year Review Process

Ruth Nicholson provided some context for the presentation. She explained that there were several reviews performed at Hanford, each with a different focus. Those included the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) Five-Year Review, the TPA Five-Year Review, as well as ongoing five-year and ten-year plans for the Site and DOE Sites nationwide. John Price, Ecology, would be providing an overview of the TPA Five-Year review, including what it was and why it was performed.

John Price explained that the TPA designated that every five years, the agencies would convene to determine if there has been substantial compliance with the agreement and to identify necessary changes to the agreement. One of DOE's contractors maintained a log of things that needed to be updated in the TPA, which the TPA agencies would collectively review and reach agreement upon.

When changes are made to the TPA, the changes are reviewed against the EPA public involvement plan to determine if those changes are substantive enough to require public comment. Administrative changes are an example of those not substantial enough to require public involvement. In the most recent review, most changes made were administrative, with only two proposed changes likely meriting public comment. One of those changes related planning and budgeting, however, the agencies were at an impasse on implementing those changes. The other change, which was already implemented in practice due to COVID-19 pandemic-imposed conditions, was the shift to electronic correspondence and recordkeeping. That change could require comments due to environmental justice implications, such as computer accessibility and considerations such as the need for public-use computers for the purpose of accessing the Administrative Record.

He noted that the different five-year reviews, including those that review Records of Decision (ROD), TPA changes, and the DOE-published five-year vision, each had potential for public comment opportunity.

Committee Discussion

Jeff Burright explained the background for the PIC's desire for the topic and discussion. The HAB's previous consensus Advice, #310, discussed public involvement in what were defined as "foundational documents." That advice was triggered from a scenario related to the [Central Plateau Inner Area Principles and Parameters](#) document where the HAB and public provided input toward that document six years prior, but after a long period of no feedback was implemented into the TPA with no communication or indication that the public's concerns were addressed. The Board's advice specifically asked for public involvement in that document. The response from the TPA agencies indicated that this document might be covered as part of the TPA Five-Year review.

Jeff stated that the committee was looking for acknowledgement that the agencies heard what the Board said in its request for input on that document and hoped to learn what that public involvement piece might look like.

John felt it would be helpful to review the origins of that document. He explained how the Board assembled the Exposure Scenarios Task Force to hold workshops and gather data that would ultimately be included in HAB Advice #132, which served as the genesis for the *Central Plateau Inner Area Principles and Parameters*. The agencies received related Advice in #283, which was also responded to. At that time, the principles were being incorporated into work plans, but it was decided that they could become a separate document that was incorporated by reference, which was how it became an appendix to the TPA. John did not believe that many changes were made to the document, and those that were not substantial enough for public comment. An example of a change made was an update to the source data used to calculate lifetime cancer risk against certain chemicals.

Jeff further explained the committee's concerns. Board Advice #283 contained suggestions for the end document, but it was not apparent that those suggestions were addressed within the document or were being considered elsewhere. The Board had many questions that affected how people understood the Site's end state, which would be especially important were term limits to be enforced on the Board, as people with the memory of the Exposure Scenarios Task Force would be lost. The committee hoped to learn if the TPA review or public involvement components would look at that input, and if now, when it would be addressed.

John thought that some of Jeff's examples sounded like discussion points from 2014. He wondered if, rather than discussing those as part of the five-year review, it would be more valuable to have a primer on

the decisions made in developing that document, as little had changed from that point. He thought that the situation highlighted a challenge of public involvement at Hanford; though a presentation on a topic may have been given in the past newer participants would not necessarily have that information. Jeff noted that the Site would benefit from an “anoointed storyteller” that could fit all the various pieces of the overall story together and repeat them. John thought that was a good concept.

To clarify, Liz Mattson asked if the TPA Five-Year Review would not be an appropriate place to comment on the *Central Plateau Inner Area Principles and Parameters*. John did not believe it to be. Jason Capron, DOE, confirmed that there were no changes to that document other than editorial changes since its issuance in 2020. John followed up, stating that the committee did not need to feel limited by the public comment period. If it thought that the principles and parameters was important to talk about, then it should do so.

Tom Sicilia noted that the River and Plateau Committee (RAP) was working to get that topic into its meeting agendas. Referencing Jason’s statement, he asked if there had been any changes in the 2016 to 2020 time period, between the HAB’s related advice and publication. Jason explained that before that point, the principles and parameters were already being incorporated into Central Plateau work plans. There were no changes to that underlying guidance, and changes that were made were in the interest of making it an integrated document. Tom noted that he recalled seeing reference to Representative Analogous Site Coordinating Agency Liaisons (RASCAL) teams in the 2020 publication, but not in the content available in 2016, which may be considered substantial enough for comment as part of the review. Jason confirmed that the RASCAL team references were added.

Shannon Cram advocated for normalization of telling the Hanford story in a way that was accessible to the public. She like Jeff’s idea of a storyteller, as she was worried that the context of the available information would be lost to future generations. Without knowing what the end state of the Site was, it was difficult to communicate what was being done over the course of generations. She felt it was strange to operate under such an abstraction. John noted that the first chapter of the document served as a concise summary of what was going on at only five and half pages, which allowed a reader to determine if it would be telling a story of the end state. Shannon clarified, as an example, Advice #283 asked for the DOE to evaluate risk in the Central Plateau and inner areas that included tribal use scenarios, to which the response stated it would run those scenarios for informational purposes. She felt that needed more articulation to understand how informational use would compare to an organizing principle or how the likelihood of exposure was being imagined. John felt that DOE or EPA would be better suited to answer that question.

Liz suggested the formation of an Issue Manager (IM) team or reading group to discuss the document more freely. She asked for clarification: were the Board to write advice on the *Central Plateau Inner Area Principles and Parameters*, would the TPA agencies be open to it? John confirmed that Ecology would be and Roberto Armijo, EPA, confirmed that EPA would be.

Gerry Pollet stated that, as part of a principles and parameters examination, it was important to look to the rejection of the tribal use scenario from the document. He stated that 20 years prior, DOE formally stated that it extinguished tribal reserved rights on the Central Plateau, which was incorporated by reference into formal documents. He stated it was important for the Board to work with the federally recognized tribes in advocating that the rights to the resources reserved under the treaties of 1855 could not be extinguished, and that the matter should be of great importance to the State of Washington as well.

Jeff recommended that an IM team be formed under RAP instead, as PIC's purpose was to show the importance of public input, which was largely achieved. Liz agreed to bring it up at a relevant RAP meeting.

Fiscal Year 2023 Work Plan and Calendar Overview

Gary Younger introduced the draft work plan and calendar for FY23. He clarified that the document was only meant to serve as a "conversation starter" and that he fully expected it would need to be further refined. He stated that the input from each of the committees would be utilized during the Board's Leadership Workshop, where further drafts would be developed before review and approval by the full Board.

He explained the changes to the draft work against the current work plan. He stated that DOE was looking at potential changes to Board meetings, having found that quarterly meetings did not work as well as intended. Instead, those would move to every other month. There was a new evening component added based on Board and public feedback. That evening session would serve as time for TPA updates and other presentations, then the following day would allow for discussion of presentations, Board work, and Board actions. It was hoped that the shorter evening sessions would serve as an opportunity to draw attendance from the broader public as well.

The drafts also included a three-hour Committee of the Whole (COTW) meeting every quarter. For committee meetings, instead of eight-hour meetings, those were shortened but scheduled more frequently.

The draft included a potential year-long agenda, with anticipated topics of interest or importance aligned with scheduled meetings throughout the year. Those with aligned with anticipated Site projects. The topics in the work plan would mostly consist of informational updates, with the expectation that emerging issues or advice would sometimes come forward.

Gary reiterated that the calendar and work plan would be flexible to changes or updates as needed.

Regulatory Perspectives

Roberto Armijo stated that the document was shared with the EPA's project office and that EPA was still discussing the document internally. It planned to share feedback with DOE when it was available.

Ryan Miller stated that Ecology's situation was similar. He noted that, while Ecology was not involved in the process of developing the draft, it was provided for review. The draft was still under evaluation.

Committee Discussion

Tom Sicilia was unsure how the proposed Board meeting timing and structure would allow for the Board to review, work, and pass consensus advice. In the present structure, there was time in the first day of the meeting to introduce draft advice and discuss it amongst the Board. He also wondered if PIC would need to be scheduled in front of the Board meeting for travel purposes. Gary noted that committee meetings were expected to stay virtual for the near term. Tom stated that in-person meetings were particularly valuable as the Board members termed out and new members joined due to the opportunity for informal discussion.

Liz Mattson shared Tom's concern about the Board's ability to do work under that meeting structure. For topics, she asked if the listed topics were the one or only topic the TPA agencies wanted to present for those meetings. Gary stated those were just ideas for anticipated topics of interest.

Gerry Pollet did not feel that DOE should be setting the Board's agenda. He stated that, when looking at environmental justice, evening meetings needed to be considered and there was no justification for not doing it. He also asked about COVID-19 vaccination and results testing in relation to in-person meetings. Gary was not sure about how COVID-19 concerns would be handled yet and rules around that could change by the first meeting on that calendar in October. He stated that the meeting topics listed just served as a first offer or "conversation starter," which the present discussion was being held. Evening meetings sessions were being added to Board meetings, which were scheduled for every other month. TPA updated and a presentation on an additional topic were scheduled for 5:00PM on the first day of the meeting, which would hopefully draw in more participants from the public. Gerry felt that, were the public able to ask questions and comment, rather than just observe, that would be worthwhile. He stated that it was important that public comment be allowed during that time.

Liz wondered if adding committee call placeholders would be helpful and wondered if the arrangement of the committee meetings would result in less time for committees to get their work done.

Dan Solitz hoped to consider implementing a meeting process utilized by the Environmental Justice Advisory Committee, stating that it created a feedback loop that increased public participation and the effectiveness of that participation.

Jeff Burright asked that consider what might be missing from the draft. He thought it would be worthwhile to define what an emerging topics process might consist of to ensure that new topics could be added without issue. He planned to discuss that at the Leadership Workshop.

He asked, in the vision for the full Board meeting, when the Board would have time to do "wordsmithing after parties." He noted that was a common occurrence and part of the process that should be accounted for. He suggested that presentations and discussions occur together, as those discussion were best held while the associated subject matter expert (SME) was still in the room. For the calendar overall, he wanted to better understand how advice would flow between committee, IM team, and the Board.

Referencing the PIC list of topics, Shelley Cimon wondered how environmental justice would be relevant to the Board or how it affected the worksite. Gary stated that it was his understanding that DOE-HQ was looking for someone to lead a Justice40 team at Hanford and would provide more information as it was learned. Shelley felt that the Board's focus needed to remain on cleanup. DOE could provide a presentation on what that eventual group was doing, but until then, it was best not to waste the Board's time on that. The Board's time was better spent where "the rubber meets the road."

Shelley also felt that gathering ideas from individuals did not amount to collaboration in work plan development. She strongly recommended that there be workshop to determine how the Board can operate going forward. The Board kept hearing that DOE wants change, but there was nothing on paper to make it clear what that would consist of or if it made sense for the Board, accounting for its size and history. The Board needed to see DOE's needs to it could work back from that, see how those needs could be addressed in a timely manner, and how that related to the actual cleanup for Hanford. She suggested looking to future COTW to figure out scenarios for changing operations. Gary agreed, stating that there was initial planning occurring for a meeting of that sort.

Tom wondered where a regional meeting would fit into the calendar. Gary stated that was to be decided.

Liz noted that she did not want the HAB to serve as a "one size fits all" solution to public involvement. She stated that it needed to be understood that the Board had work to get done, even if it felt tedious at times. Rather than trying to get the public to attend Board meetings, she suggested that DOE step back and examine its public involvement efforts overall and how it could engage the public meaningfully.

Additionally, Liz stated that evening Board meeting sessions could have the impact of losing parental involvement. She suggested that lunchtime would be more conducive for that population.

Chris Sutton agreed with Shelley's comments on environmental justice as it related to cleanup at Hanford. He stated that cleanup is driven by the TPA and milestones; impact to those should be considered in determining environmental justice's relevance to cleanup.

Shannon Cram welcomed the potential environmental justice topic, stating that there was not a shared understanding of what that conversation needed to consist of.

Dan felt that there was nowhere for the HAB to go with the environmental justice topic at that time and would need to hear from DOE on that. Gary reiterated that more would be known when that related team within DOE was established. Roberto recalled that EPA and Ecology each provided high-level overview presentations to the committee of how it related to those agency's work in the past.

Jeff asked that committee members submit any additional considerations for him to bring to later work plan discussions

Open Forum/Assessing the Balance between Policy Work and Technical Understanding

Jeff Burright introduced a topic he hoped to cover in the open forum: an assessment of the balance between policy work and technical understanding. He explained that the topic came about in relation to a Government Accountability Office (GAO) report recommendation around involving the public in decision-making processes for tank closure and to "communicate in a way that addresses their concerns regarding technical challenges and provides transparent information about the science and rationale behind those decisions." Additionally, the committee held a previous round robin discussion on the topic where DOE's assurances to the Board, established in the first HAB meeting were discussed, such as the Board's scope of work not being limited and SME availability.

As a result of those discussions, the committee formed an IM team to further investigate the topic. He noted that the Board's recently passed advice on tank leak response planning was a policy-based piece of advice that was backed by technical information. He was interested to learn how that was being received.

Jeff introduced a matrix of the Board's values and concerns around related subjects, as well as the associated supporting ideas or commitments, and other supporting information, as well as what advice might result from a topic. He reviewed the information contained in the matrix, column by column. As he reviewed the information, several committee members offered thoughts and comments.

Jacob Reynolds, Non-Union, Non-Management Employees, explained that it was difficult to separate technical information from policy advice. As an example, he stated that spending priorities advice was driven by technical aspects. He did not feel that the Board's advice was typically technical in nature; the last one he felt was technical advice was one related to building new waste storage tanks. However, he expected that if the Board had known more of the technical information behind the issue, it likely would not have issued that same advice and DOE likely would have been happier with what it received. He felt that DOE would benefit from embracing the technical aspects of various topics differently. Jeff added related information to his matrix.

Liz Mattson noted that recent LERF and ETF meetings had an issue with communicating technical information. She understood that it was difficult to make Hanford information accessible, but in order to break the information down, it needed to be well understood. She expected that a depth of public understanding could be built by starting at a high level and providing specific examples, rather than "staying in the weeds."

Shannon Cram explained that, in considering the broader public as opposed to the HAB, a technical background or understanding was not necessary to care about results. As an example, when considering the future of the Site, technical information or an understanding of the decisions made to reach the end state were not necessary. She did not want to limit who can be part of the larger conversation of Hanford. Jeff agreed and noted that there might be multiple pieces of advice to consider, as how HAB members needs for accessed technical content was not the same as the broader public.

Chris Sutton recalled a previous presentation given to the HAB by Brian Vance of DOE. He suggested that DOE looked to the HAB to inform the broader public of the cleanup mission successes. He thought that the HAB's role in presenting technical information in an accessible manner should be considered.

Liz noted that the discussion reminded her of the past committee meeting structure. In the past, she found meeting in person to be helpful for the audiences understanding of technical information. In those meetings, it was often clear when people did not understand the information being presented, which allowed speakers to adjust how it was being explained.

Following a full review of the matrix, Jeff reviewed the potential pieces of advice that could be pursued.

Shannon felt that, considering recent discussion of the Board structure and seats, she thought the information drawn from the first HAB meeting was particularly valuable as it showed how the Board's role was framed. She thought it would be valuable to either pursue a recommitment to that role or get that clarified, as there seemed to be conflicting visions of the HAB's role.

Chris noted that, whatever that results of such an effort were, the Board's role should always be in the context of cleanup. Cleanup was expected to last at least another 50 years, with long-term stewardship beyond that. Given that length of time, he stated, constant iteration of many topics, including technical ones, would be necessary.

Jeff asked the committee for input on what idea to pursue first. He reiterated that the discussion primarily consisted of clarifying the HAB's mission how to communicate technical information and continuously iterate it for public over time, and how the Board can get access to the information it needed to develop policy advice. Noted that there were developments in getting SMEs to discuss topics more freely with HAB committees, without the need for presentations. Liz suggested that outlines be developed to see how the resulting advice might be shaped.

The committee considered the timeline for potential advice. It was noted that the next Board meeting was in June, and if the committee wanted to present advice by that time, it would need an additional PIC meeting in advance to approve a draft.

Jeff stated that the IM team would meet to explore what advice could be drafted.

Ruth Nicholson invited other open forum topics.

Shelley Cimon asked for updated information on the HAB membership packet, if Ecology and EPA were providing input, and what opportunity the Board would have to weigh in on filling open seats, such as the one previously held by Hanford Watch.

Ryan Miller explained that he attended a public involvement officer's meeting in which he learned that DOE had already submitted the packet. Ecology was not part of the process in finalizing that submission and had since requested a copy of what was submitted but had not yet seen that. He was unable to say much on the process, as that was only a recent development. Ecology was presently in discussions with DOE on the matter.

Gary Younger stated it was planned for each of the TPA agencies to get together and discuss the packet, as it was recognized that steps in the process did not go well. The agencies would discuss a path forward, which would be shared with the HAB when decided.

Shelley stated that she was surprised and alarmed to learn that an industry organization, the Fruit Growers Association, was put into an environmental seat. That caused her worry for the rest of packet and wondered what other organizations were included or excluded and whether they were true representatives of the regional concerns or diversity.

Gerry Pollet stated that, per the HAB's charter, it was the responsibility of other seats within a category to fill vacancies and was instead unilaterally filled DOE by an organization with a dismal track record on environmental justice issues. Ryan assured him that Ecology expressed similar concerns and that would be a topic of conversation when the TPA agencies convened to discuss the packet. Gerry suggested that, before the meeting, there should be a conference call held with the environmental interest groups. Ryan agreed to forward that request.

Tom Sicilia noted that there was a previous mention of a second group being considered for the packet. He asked what group that was and what seat it would fill. Gary felt that further discussion of seats would be inappropriate until the TPA agencies held their discussions.

Liz asked if there was an update regarding a previous idea of extending Board member terms through September, to the anticipated packet renewal timeframe. Gary stated that was an issue facing all the boards and a formal recommendation had been submitted to DOE-HQ.

Committee Business

The committee considered plans and topics for its next meeting, which had a placeholder for August. It was noted that the meeting might need to consist only of informational content, as it was expected that many committee members would be awaiting HAB membership renewal during that time and would be unable to participate in committee actions. Jeff Burright asked if there were informational topics that would be of interest to the committee.

Ginger Wireman, Ecology, noted that Ecology might have some presentations available that could be reworked for the HAB. She suggested that it could be worthwhile look at Ecology's Hanford mailing lists examine the diversity of those that ask to receive Hanford information. That could involve issuing a survey, though only the most engaged or interested would likely respond. The PIC would be able to provide feedback on the draft survey.

Jeff noted that another outstanding topic of interest for the committee was the best means of communicating end states to the general public and "story telling" of current events to future generations

Ginger stated that Ecology expected to roll out a Spanish version of its pre-TPA story map in the near future. Ryan Miller noted that was an extension of Ecology's [Hanford Overview](#) webpage, launched in 2020. Jeff recommended that committee members reviewed the story map. Ginger suggested that a potential cleanup focused story map could be a future topic for PIC to explore.

Other Topics

Liz Mattson noted that a recently published book, [The Intersectional Environmentalist](#), may serve as a good starting point in learning how environmental justice and environmentalism were intertwined. She also noted that Hanford Challenge was working on a project in cooperation with a University of Washington student to explore how to start a story that would be heard by future generations. She thought

there may be lessons learned from other public health campaigns in that effort, including what had been retained in public consciousness and what had been lost.

Gerry Pollet noted that he was conducting workshops that week on the Hanford cleanup budget to assist the public in developing submissions for the open public comment periods. He noted that those workshops were repeated, providing people options of attending during evening or lunch sessions, resulting in greater overall participation, which was relevant to earlier comments on the Board meeting structure in the draft FY23 HAB Work Plan.

The committee discussed expectations for upcoming in-person meetings. It was explained that the Leadership Workshop, scheduled for May, was intended to serve as an initial test for a “hybrid” meeting structure.

Closing

In recognition that many PIC members’ terms on the HAB would end prior to the next PIC meeting, Jeff Burright thanked those present for their contributions to the committee.

Meeting Recording

<https://youtu.be/EZ2nAaiChqc>

Attachments

[Attachment 1: Deputy Designated Federal Officer Slide](#)

[Attachment 2: Meeting Agenda](#)

[Attachment 3: Draft December 2021 PIC Meeting Minutes](#)

[Attachment 4: Draft February 2022 PIC Meeting Minutes](#)

[Attachment 5: Force Field Analysis Template](#)

[Attachment 6: Draft FY23 HAB Work Plan](#)

[Attachment 7: Draft FY23 HAB Calendar](#)

[Attachment 8: HAB Issue Manager Team List](#)

Attendees

Board Members and Alternates:

Bob Suyama, Primary	Dan Solitz, Primary	Denise Jones, Primary
Gerry Pollet, Primary	Jacob Reynolds, Primary	Shannon Cram, Primary
Shelley Cimon, Primary	Steve Anderson, Primary	Tom Galioto, Primary
Chris Sutton, Alternate	Dan Strom, Alternate	Jeff Burright, Alternate
Liz Mattson, Alternate	Tom Sicilia, Alternate	

Others:

Carrie Meyer, DOE	Daina McFadden, Ecology	Abigail Zilar, GSSC for DOE
-------------------	-------------------------	-----------------------------

Gary Younger, DOE	Ginger Wireman, Ecology	Coleen Drinkard, HMIS
Jason Capron, DOE	John Price, Ecology	Dana Cowley, HMIS
Michael Cline, DOE	Ryan Miller, Ecology	Debra Yergen HMIS
Paul Noel, DOE	Roberto Armijo, EPA	Dieter Bohrmann, CPCCo
		Josh Patnaude, HAB Facil.
		Kearn Lee
		Li Wang, YN ERWM
		Marcel Bergeron, WRPS
		Miya Burke, Hanford Challenge
		Olivia Wilcox, HAB Facil.
		Patrick Conrad, HMIS
		Ruth Nicholson, HAB Facil.
		Stephanie Brasher, HMIS

Note: Participants for this virtual meeting were asked to sign in with their name and affiliation in the chat box of Microsoft Teams. Not all attendees shared this information. The attendance list reflects what information was collected at the meeting.